



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,500	08/22/2003	Gerold Herold	32860-000610/US	8715
30596	7590	09/05/2007	EXAMINER	
<b>HARNESS, DICKEY &amp; PIERCE, P.L.C.</b> P.O.BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195				LOVEL, KIMBERLY M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/05/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/645,500	HEROLD ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Kimberly Lovel	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 20 June 2007.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending in the current application. In the Amendment filed 20 June 2007, none of the claims were amended. This action is made Final.
3. The rejections of claims 1-29 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0087359 to Bocionek in view of US PGPub 2003/0233366 to Kesselman further in view of US Patent No. 6,560,607 to Lassesen have been maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0087359 to Bocionek (hereafter Bocionek) in view of US PGPub 2003/0233366 to Kesselman (hereafter Kesselman) further in view of US Patent No. 6,560,607 to Lassesen (hereafter Lassesen).**

**Referring to claim 1**, Bocionek discloses a data processing system for processing medically relevant data objects including at least one of image data and metadata (see abstract), comprising:

a first electronic data processing device [operator consoles 5-8] for viewing and editing the data objects (see [0021], lines 7-11), the first electronic data processing device including,

a data store for storing the data objects [medical images and patient data are stored locally within the workstations] (see [0021], lines 7-11), and

a first interface for outputting data objects (see [0025]); and  
a second electronic data processing [workstation 11] (see [0023]), the second electronic data processing device including,

a second interface for receiving the data objects [communication network 9] (see [0023], lines 1-4),

wherein

the first data processing device uses firmly prescribed data formats [DICOM], unalterable by a user, to store, view and edit data objects (see [0021] and [0025]), and

the interfaces of the first and second processing devices are connectable to one another for transfer of data objects from the first data processing device to the second data processing device (see [0022], lines 1-3; [0023], lines 1-4; and [0025]).

However, while Bocionek discloses a second processing device, Bocionek fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the second electronic data processing device presenting and altering data from data objects in reports using report masks, wherein the second electronic data processing device has a mask memory for storing the report masks and uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user to present and alter data from data objects, even without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects. Kesselman discloses creating formatted reports containing extracts from the database including a processing device for presenting data from data objects in medically relevant reports (see [0055], lines 16-27), the electronic data processing device includes a mask memory for storing the report masks [the system database stores the collection of Special Metadata 182, which mask the reports] (see [0055], lines 20-27) and the data processing device uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user to present data from data objects, even without the knowledge of the syntax of the data objects (see [0055], lines 20-27) in order to improve the diversity of database system with which the clients and users can interact.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the report masks of Kesselman to present the data disclosed by Bocionek on a second device. One would have been motivated to do so in order to improve the diversity of database system with which the clients and users can interact (Kesselman: see [0005], lines 1-4).

While the combination of Bocionek and Kesselman (hereafter Bocionek/Kesselman) discloses a second processing device, which uses reports to

display data, Bocionek/Kesselman fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of using reports to alter data. Lassesen discloses obtaining data from a database and displaying the data in the form of a report to a user (see column 15, lines 21-34), including the further limitation of using the report to alter data (see column 15, lines 35-49) in order to provide a user-friendly interface for modifying data in a database.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the ability to modify data in a database you reports as disclosed by Lassesen with the reports and database of Bocionek/Kesselman. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a user-friendly interface for modifying data in a database.

**Referring to claim 2,** the combination of Bocionek/Kesselman and Lassesen (hereafter Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen) discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second data processing device stores report masks at least one of generated and altered by the user [stores a collection of Special Metadata 182] (Kesselman: see [0055], lines 20-27).

**Referring to claim 3,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second data processing device uses report masks, generate able and alterable by the user without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects, in order for a user to edit data from data objects [Reports 54 are documents which may exist independently from the medium in which they are distributed and may be output in many different file formats including but not limited to: ASCII, Microsoft Word, Excel, Adobe PDF, printed documents, documents opened in a

window on the user's system and other defined formats] (Kesselman: see [0029], lines 6-12).

**Referring to claim 4,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein at least one of the interfaces includes the data switching device, the data switching device having access to an association memory containing information about an association between data object types and report masks, and wherein the data switching device is adapted to ascertain the type of a data object transferred via the interface, compare the ascertained type with the content of the association memory and associate a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of the comparison (Kesselman: see [0033], lines 1-21).

**Referring to claim 5,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the interfaces on the first and second data processing devices, when interconnected, are useable to transfer data belonging to data objects from the second data processing device to the first data processing device, and wherein data objects with user-edited data, transferred to the first data processing device via the interconnected interfaces, are stored in the data store (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 6,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 5, wherein content of user-edited data is checked by the data switching device, and the checked data are stored by the first data processing device only on the basis of the result of the check (Lassesen: see column 7 – column 8).

**Referring to claim 7**, Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first data processing device is for authenticating all access operations to data objects by users in a manner which the user cannot alter and documents them for later reconstruction (Lassesen: see column 11, lines 32-49).

**Referring to claim 8**, Bocionek discloses a distributed method for processing medically relevant data objects, including at least one of image data and metadata (see abstract), with a first component [operator consoles 5-8] for at least one of viewing, editing and storing the data objects (see [0021], lines 7-11) and with a second component [workstation 11] for presenting data from the data objects (see [0023]), comprising:

using prescribed data formats [DICOM] in the first component, which are unalterable by a user, to at least one of store, view and edit the data objects (see [0021] and [0025]);

However, while Bocionek discloses a component, Bocionek fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the second component using report masks in the second component, which are at least one of generateable and alterable by the user without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects, to present and alter data from the data objects, wherein data objects are transferable from the first to the second component. Kesselman discloses creating formatted reports containing extracts from the database including the further limitation of using report masks in the second component, which are at least one of generateable and alterable by the user (see

[0055], lines 16-27) without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects. [Reports 54 are documents which may exist independently from the medium in which they are distributed and may be output in many different file formats including but not limited to: ASCII, Microsoft Word, Excel, Adobe PDF, printed documents, documents opened in a window on the user's system and other defined formats] (see [0029], lines 6-12), to present and alter data from the data objects, wherein data objects are transferable from the first to the second component (see [0022], lines 1-3; [0023], lines 1-4; and [0025]) in order to improve the diversity of database system with which the clients and users can interact.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the report masks of Kesselman to present the data disclosed by Bocionek on a second device. One would have been motivated to do so in order to improve the diversity of database system with which the clients and users can interact (Kesselman: see [0005], lines 1-4).

While the combination of Bocionek and Kesselman (hereafter Bocionek/Kesselman) discloses a second processing device, which uses reports to display data, Bocionek/Kesselman fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of using reports to alter data. Lassesen discloses obtaining data from a database and displaying the data in the form of a report to a user (see column 15, lines 21-34), including the further limitation of using the report to alter data (see column 15, lines 35-49) in order to provide a user-friendly interface for modifying data in a database.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the ability to modify data in a database you reports as disclosed by Lassesen with the reports and database of Bocionek/Kesselman. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a user-friendly interface for modifying data in a database.

**Referring to claim 9,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen teaches the distributed method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the second data processing device stores report masks at least one of generated and altered by the user [the system database stores the collection of Special Metadata 182, which mask the reports] (Kesselman: see [0055], lines 20-27).

**Referring to claim 10,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the second method component uses report masks for a user to edit data from the data objects (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 11,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method as claimed in claim 8, wherein a data switching component is provided for ascertaining the type of a data object transferred from the first to the second component, for comparing the ascertained type with the content of an association memory containing information about the association between data object types and report masks, and for associating a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of this comparison (Kesselman: see [0033], lines 1-21).

**Referring to claim 12,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method as claimed in claim 8, wherein data belonging to data objects is transferable from the second to the first component, and wherein the first component stores data objects with user-edited data, transferred to the first component, in a data store (Kesselman: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 13,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method as claimed in claim 12, wherein the content of user-edited data belonging to data objects is checked, and the user-edited data are stored by the first component only on the basis of the result of this check (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 14,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses teaches the distributed method as claimed in claim 8, wherein the first component authenticates all access operations to data objects by users in a manner which the user cannot alter and documents them so that they can be subsequently reconstructed (Lassesen: see column 11, lines 32-49).

**Referring to claim 15,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 2, wherein the second data processing device uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects, in order for a user to edit data from data objects (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 16,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein at least one of the interfaces includes data switching means, having access to an association memory containing information

about an association between data object types and report masks, for ascertaining the type of a data object transferred via the interface, for comparing the ascertained type with the content of the association memory and for associating a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of the comparison (Lassesen: see column 7 – column 8).

**Referring to claim 17,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 4, wherein the interfaces on the first and second data processing devices, when interconnected, are useable to transfer data belonging to data objects from the second data processing device to the first data processing device, and wherein data objects with user-edited data, transferred to the first data processing device via the interconnected interfaces, are stored in the data store (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 18,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 17, wherein content of user-edited data is checked, and the checked data are stored by the first data processing device only on the basis of the result of the check (Lassesen: see column 7 – column 8).

**Referring to claim 19,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method of claim 8, wherein the second component is used to present data from the data objects in medically relevant reports using the report masks (Kesselman: see [0055], lines 16-27).

**Referring to claim 20,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method as claimed in claim 9, wherein the second method component uses report

masks for a user to edit data from the data objects (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 21,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen teaches the distributed method as claimed in claim 9, wherein a data switching component is provided for ascertaining the type of a data object transferred from the first to the second component, for comparing the ascertained type with the content of an association memory containing information about the association between data object types and report masks, and for associating a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of this comparison (Kesselman: see [0033], lines 1-21).

**Referring to claim 22,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the distributed method as claimed in claim 10, wherein a data switching component is provided for ascertaining the type of a data object transferred from the first to the second component, for comparing the ascertained type with the content of an association memory containing information about the association between data object types and report masks, and for associating a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of this comparison (Kesselman: see [0033], lines 1-21).

**Referring to claim 23,** Bocionek discloses a data processing system for processing medically relevant data objects including at least one of image data and metadata (see abstract), comprising:

a first electronic data processing means [operator consoles 5-8] for viewing and editing the data objects (see [0021], lines 7-11), the first electronic data processing device including,

storage means for storing the data objects [medical images and patient data are stored locally within the workstations] (see [0021], lines 7-11), and first interfacing means for outputting data objects (see [0025]); and second electronic data processing means [workstation 11] (see [0023]), the second electronic data processing device including,

second interfacing means for receiving the data objects [communication network 9] (see [0023], lines 1-4),

wherein

the first data processing means uses firmly prescribed data formats [DICOM], unalterable by a user, to store, view and edit data objects (see [0021] and [0025]), and

the interfacing means of the first and second processing means are connectable to one another for transfer of data objects from the first data processing means to the second data processing means (see [0022], lines 1-3; [0023], lines 1-4; and [0025]).

However, while Bocionek discloses a second processing means, Bocionek fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of the second electronic data processing means presenting and altering data from data objects in reports using report masks, wherein the second electronic data processing means has a mask memory for storing the report masks and uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user to present and alter data from data objects, even without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects. Kesselman discloses creating formatted reports containing extracts from

the database including a processing device for presenting data from data objects in medically relevant reports (see [0055], lines 16-27), the electronic data processing device includes a mask memory for storing the report masks [the system database stores the collection of Special Metadata 182, which mask the reports] (see [0055], lines 20-27) and the data processing means uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user to present data from data objects, even without the knowledge of the syntax of the data objects (see [0055], lines 20-27) in order to improve the diversity of database system with which the clients and users can interact.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the report masks of Kesselman to present the data disclosed by Bocionek on a second device. One would have been motivated to do so in order to improve the diversity of database system with which the clients and users can interact (Kesselman: see [0005], lines 1-4).

While the combination of Bocionek and Kesselman (hereafter Bocionek/Kesselman) discloses a second processing device, which uses reports to display data, Bocionek/Kesselman fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of using reports to alter data. Lassesen discloses obtaining data from a database and displaying the data in the form of a report to a user (see column 15, lines 21-34), including the further limitation of using the report to alter data (see column 15, lines 35-49) in order to provide a user-friendly interface for modifying data in a database.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the ability to modify data in a database you reports as disclosed by

Lassesen with the reports and database of Bocionek/Kesselman. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a user-friendly interface for modifying data in a database.

**Referring to claim 24,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 23, wherein the second data processing means stores report masks at least one of generated and altered by the user [the system database stores the collection of Special Metadata 182, which masks the reports] (Kesselman: see [0055], lines 20-27).

**Referring to claim 25,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 23, wherein the second data processing means uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects, in order for a user to edit data from data objects (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 26,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 23, wherein at least one of the interfacing means includes the data switching means, the data switching means having access to an association memory containing information about an association between data object types and report masks, for ascertaining the type of a data object transferred via the interface means, for comparing the ascertained type with the content of the association memory and for associating a report mask with the data object on the basis of the result of the comparison (Kesselman: see [0033], lines 1-21).

**Referring to claim 27,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 23, wherein the interfacing means on the first and second data processing means, when interconnected, are useable to transfer data belonging to data objects from the second data processing means to the first data processing means, and wherein data objects with user-edited data, transferred to the first data processing means via the interconnected interfaces, are stored in the storage means (Lassesen: see column 15, lines 35-65).

**Referring to claim 28,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 27 wherein content of user-edited data is checked, and the checked data are stored by the first data processing means only on the basis of the result of the check (Lassesen: see column 7 – column 8).

**Referring to claim 29,** Bocionek/Kesselman/Lassesen discloses the data processing system as claimed in claim 23, wherein the first data processing means is for authenticating all access operations to data objects by users in a manner which the user cannot alter and documents them for later reconstruction (Lassesen: see column 11, lines 32-49).

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 20 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to applicants' arguments on page 11 concerning claims 1, 8 and 23, applicant argues the following: Even if Lassesen does not disclose altering data shown in a report, neither Bocioneck, Kesselman nor Lassesen disclose, teach or suggest altering data in a report as well as altering the report itself. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that these references fail to disclose teach or suggest a "second data processing device uses report masks, generateable and alterable by the user to present and alter data from objects, even without knowledge of the syntax of the data objects," as recited in independent claim 1 or the somewhat similar features of independent claims 8 and 23.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Kesselman is utilized to teach the concept of altering the report itself. Kesselman teaches in lines 20-27 of paragraph [0055], customizing formatted presentation reports utilizing Special Metadata 182. The customized formatted presentation reports are considered to represent the report masks. Furthermore, Lassesen is utilized to teach the concept of altering the data in a report. Column 15, lines 35-49 of Lassesen discloses utilizing a report to edit data. The rejection utilizes the concept of using a report to alter data objects disclosed by Lassesen with the report masks of Kesselman. Therefore, the combination of Bocioneck, Kesselman and Lassesen discloses the concept of altering data in a report as well as altering the report itself.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

3 September 2007  
kml

*Neveen Abel-Jalil*  
Primary Examiner  
Neveen Abel-Jalil